

## REMARKS

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, 17, and 18 are in the application. Claims 1, 17, and 18 are currently amended; claims 2, 3, and 6 – 10 were previously presented; claims 4, 5, and 12 – 16 have been canceled; and claim 11 remains unchanged from the original version thereof. Claims 1, 17, and 18 are the independent claims herein.

No new matter has been added to the application as a result of the amendments submitted herewith.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112**

Claims 1, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is traversed.

Applicant submits claims 1, 17, and 18 were not indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. However, in an effort to advance prosecution and put the present application in a condition for allowance (or at least reduce the issues), Claims 1, 17, and 18 are each currently amended to state, “wherein the aggregated view of the availability states for each of said at least one media capability associated with the identity does not *display* said plurality of communication devices associated with the identity via the user interface”. That is, the claimed method, article of manufacture, and system provide an aggregated view of the availability states for each of the at least one media capabilities where the aggregated view does not display the plurality of communication devices associated with the identity. Applicant clearly and specifically claims the

aggregated view does not display the communication devices associated with an identity.

The current claims 1, 17, and 18 (at least now) are not indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The currently amended claims do not require any interpretation of “an indication” since the currently submitted claims concisely and unambiguously claim “the aggregated view of the availability states for each of said at least one media capability associated with the identity does not *display* said plurality of communication devices associated with the identity via the user interface”.

Applicant notes that FIGS. 4 – 7 each displays the media channel capability availability associated with the identity “Brian”, as disclosed at page 15, lines 2 – 13. Accordingly, no specific device is displayed in the user interfaces depicted in FIGS. 4 – 7. Instead, a media channel capability (e.g., phone calls, instant messages) availability (e.g., “smiley” face icon, “not smiley” face icon) is shown for the identity Brian. Since phone calls may be received by any number of devices associated with the Brian identity such as, for example, a mobile phone, home phone, office phone, computer, etc. (Specification, page 6, line 17 – page 7, line 5), it is clear that the aggregated view of the availability for the media channel capabilities does not display the individual communication devices associated with the Brian identity. Instead, the aggregated view of the media channel capability availability associated with the identity “Brian” displays an overall summary availability for each media channel capability of the identity Brian, as shown in FIGS. 4 – 7.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 17, and 18 are, at least now, definite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17, and 18 under 35 USC 112.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, and 17 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Becker et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,981,223.

Applicant notes that claims 1, 17, and 18 are currently amended to further clarify that which is claimed as the invention by Applicant, as discussed above with respect to the rejection under 35 USC 112.

Claim 1 relates to a method, including determining a plurality of communication devices associated with an identity, determining at least one media capability associated with each of said plurality of communication devices, determining an availability state for each of said at least one media capability associated with each of said plurality of communication devices, where the availability state provides an indication of the availability for each of said at least one specific media capability, and providing, via a user interface, an aggregated view of the availability states for each of said at least one media capability associated with the identity, wherein the aggregated view of the availability states for each of said at least one media capability associated with the identity does not display said plurality of communication devices associated with the identity via the user interface.

Applicant notes and emphasizes the claimed aspect of "the aggregated view of the availability states for each of said at least one media capability associated with the identity does not display said plurality of communication devices associated with the identity via the user interface". Applicant further notes that claims 17 and 18, with respect to this claimed aspect, worded similar to claim 1.

Applicant reiterates that Becker explicitly discloses a "pal" and the devices associated with the "pal". (Becker, FIG. 15) Becker discloses both primary and secondary messaging options. The options depicted include a clear indication of the devices associated with the "pal" for communication purposes. Explicitly shown are the following devices: a SMS mobile phone, a J2ME phone (indicated by the handset in a circle icon that does not represent an "availability" as argued by the Examiner), a fax

machine (paper icon), and an email account (mail box icon). (Becker FIG. 15, including panels 1510 and 1560; and col. 20, ln. 30 – col. 21, ln. 6)

Applicant respectfully submits that Becker fails to disclose the claimed aspect of “the aggregated view of the availability states for each of said at least one media capability associated with the identity does not display said plurality of communication devices associated with the identity via the user interface” since Becker does not disclose any *aggregated view* of the availability states for each of the at least one media channel capabilities. Instead, Becker clearly displays the all of the devices associated with an identity (“a window 1560 pops up listing available ‘secondary’ messaging options for Lou”, col. 20, ln. 61 – 62) No “aggregated view” of media channel capabilities is provided or displayed. For example, FIG. 15 shows for “Lou” a J2ME phone, an instant message, a fax, an email account, and an internet phone messaging availability for Lou. Becker discloses showing the availability for each and every individual device associated with Lou. There is no summary or aggregated view regarding, for example, a voice (i.e., phone) communication channel for Lou. Instead, each device capable of providing phone or voice communication is displayed separately (e.g., J2ME phone and internet phone).

Also, it is noted that Becker discloses a secondary window may be provided for each of the other contacts Jane, Ken, Mary, and Ned. Thus, while a secondary pop up window similar to window 1560 is not explicitly shown for Jane, Ken, Mary, and Ned, Becker discloses that one may be generated. Accordingly, it is clear that Becker does not disclose or even suggest the claimed aspect of the “aggregated view of the availability states for each of said at least one media capability associated with the identity does not display said plurality of communication devices associated with the identity via the user interface” since Becker explicitly discloses displaying each and every individual device associated with a user – not an aggregated view of the media channel capabilities associated with the identity.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Becker fails to anticipate claims 1, 17, and 18. Applicant also submits that claims 2, 3, and 5 – 11 are also patentable over Becker under 35 USC 102 for at least depending from an allowable base claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, 17, and 18 under 35 USC 102., and the allowance of claims 1 – 3, 6 – 11, 17, and 18.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-5985.

Respectfully submitted,

March 9, 2009  
Date

/Randolph P. Calhoun/  
Randolph P. Calhoun  
Registration No. 45,371  
(203) 972-5985

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
**Customer Number: 28524**  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Department  
Telephone: 732-321-3026